Climate Action Plan Steering Committee Meeting Notes – October 12, 2012

- The meeting began with introductions and an overview of the agenda by Brendon Slotterback (project manager for the Climate Action Plan).
- Kelly Muellman from the Minnesota Department of Health (MDH) presented about potential public health impacts of the draft Climate Action Plan goals and strategies.
 - The analysis uses pathways from potential goals and strategies to short and intermediate impacts, which in turn lead to public health outcomes for affected populations.
 - In response to a question, Kelly explained that historically, some building energy efficiency improvements—e.g., home insulation—have harmed indoor air quality by reducing air flow within a home. This is less likely to be the case today as the process/materials have improved.
 - Robin Garwood suggested that the pathways include a direct link between reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and reducing air pollution.
 - Jenny Edwards noted that reduced noise pollution may be another impact of reducing VMT, and this has mental health benefits.
 - Robin suggested that using less gas by using more alternative fuels might free up more income for other benefits, like food/basic goods. Ross Abbey suggested that alternative fuels may be more expensive, so the outcome could vary.
 - A suggested strategy about reducing water use and wastewater has been incorporated in this meeting's draft emissions reduction goals and strategies.
 - Julie Ketchum noted that recycling creates jobs and has economic benefits, which may have public health implications.
 - Loren Olson suggested that there be a direct link between reduced waste and power generation as this may mean less consumption overall.
 - Louis Alemayehu noted that we should come up with strategies for community ownership of these goals. What's necessary long term is getting a significant amount of these goals incorporated into the school system. Also in terms of co-ops. Finally, coming up with greener strategies for the energy that the city consumes.
 - Kelly also walked through a summary impact table, which was included in the presentation. Summary impact tables are often incorporated into health impact assessments.
 - ° Cecilia Martinez commented that individual strategies will have varying impacts across communities within the city (or the region); this is something that will be important in deciding which strategies are implemented and how they are implemented. The environmental justice (EJ) working group will try to address this issue, but it's a tall order in a month and a half.
 - Robin pointed out that it's not always proximity alone that dictates health impacts from things like smokestacks; it's those downwind or "in the plume."
 - Amy Short noted that there are many impacts outside the city that we may not be considering. This is something to keep in mind in the final report. Being clear about scope in the final report will be important.

- Kelly explained that the impacts in MDH's analysis were not specifically limited to Minneapolis residents.
- Kelly concluded by highlighting some of the work done on climate change in the Minnesota Department of Health. Some of these projects are available on their website, with more to come soon.
- Cecilia provided a brief update on the EJ working group, highlighting the work done at the first meeting in September. The group is getting oriented to the plan process, and has set up sub-groups to look at specific strategy areas to bring back recommendations to the full group.
 - The EJ working group is coordinating with the City's Neighborhood and Community Relations department to get a broader community audience participating in the Climate Action Plan and the EJ working group.
 - The group will next meet October 30 at 2:30pm. Location is TBD, and will be posted on the Climate Action Plan website as soon as the space is finalized.
 - Loren asked how the EJ working group will come back into the larger process.
 - Cecilia replied she thought the EJ working group would come back to the Steering Committee, but that there is still some uncertainty about this process.
 - David Thornton mentioned that the MPCA has an air quality working group meeting right now. They are discussing things that may be targeted towards lower income communities; they will have a health impact, but also an environmental justice benefit. This group will be suggesting ways to implement strategies that will target specific communities of high need this is the Clean Air Dialogue. Karen Monahan is part of that process as well. The process is facilitated by Environmental Initiative.
- The second half of the meeting began with a discussion of the proposed Climate Action Plan implementation goals. These goals will help frame how to prioritize strategies and what types of conversations will need to happen to as a strategy is fleshed out for implementation.
 - Staff will review previous City-adopted language concerning what's at stake with regard to climate change. This will help the group form its own statement, if it so chooses, and will inform the final plan document, which will address this issue.
 - Brian Ross expressed some concern about the first goal. The biggest impacts on climate looking in the long-term are infrastructural; we need to make those decisions now to affect the long term. Big impacts might come later, but we need to lay the groundwork now. If we focus too much on the short-term impacts we may lose opportunities to make major reductions in GHG emissions. Focusing on "short timeframe" may not be the appropriate approach. There should be recognition that decisions made today may not have an impact until later, and we need to be cognizant of those as we move ahead.
 - Lea Foushee commented that one must use the knowledge you gained from ancestors seven generations past to make decisions for seven generations in the future. Use past

knowledge and experience to inform decisions that will affect future generations.

- Robin noted that the cumulative impact of even small amounts of extra CO2 emitted today has a long term compounding impact. There are not a lot of high impact, short time frame, and cost effective strategies there is tension there. Having "short timeframe" helps us realize we don't have time to figure things out. We need to act fast.
- Tony Hainault commented that Brian raised a very important point. It is important to focus on what can be done now, but a good example of what Brian is proposing is the Vikings stadium. They're looking at 30 year paybacks for LEED certification. You don't want to lose sight of these long term projects that are important to meeting long term goals.
- Lea provided the example of ocean acidification, which shows these long-term, irreversible impacts of GHG emissions.
- Staff will look at this tension and will try to accurately reflect both sides of the issue when editing the strategies.
- Julie added that it will be important to think about barriers to implementation as well when prioritizing.
- Ross Abbey noted that regarding goal number two, cost-savings is mentioned as a cobenefit, but there is tension between upfront costs, life cycle costs, etc. A lot of these strategies will have long term savings but will cost money up front. Perhaps change "cost savings" to "lifecycle cost savings."
- Lea asked if the City done an energy end-use analysis.
 - Brendon replied that the City has not done that. We know the amount of residential energy use vs. commercial, or for transportation, but we don't know how much is from appliances, or lighting, etc.
 - Jenny commented that there is some information publicly available but it's not Minneapolis specific.
 - Brian added that the data provided in a 1988 document is still available. These data are used in specific programs more than in a holistic way.
- Jenny noted that goal number five might imply mitigation isn't important by the specific wording. Remove "move beyond" and be more positive.
- Staff will add some draft language about what's at stake regarding climate change and will try to incorporate suggested changes to the implementation goals.
- The final part of the meeting began with an overview of the draft emissions reduction strategies, followed by a discussion of specific strategies of interest.

Buildings & Energy

- Sarah Sponheim: The franchise agreement might deserve a more explicit strategy than how it is presented in CC7.
- David: The concepts of solar energy co-ops or aggregators should be included in some sense. (Perhaps in CC2.)
- Brian: We should add a more specific strategy to the Renewable Energy section. (Brian will send draft language.)

- Tony: Regarding the franchise agreement, you should be explicit about distribution efficiency. I think we had also previously discussed water conservation as an explicit goal, so we should incorporate that.
 - Brendon: It's touched on by a few strategies, like the ones re: the IGCC or the CES program on the use side.
 - Tony: There are regulatory requirements to consume water that aren't always necessary. There should be a specific goal about water consumption reduction goals – a number. It could just be in the strategies: just be explicit about water consumption as a way of accomplishing energy efficiency.
 - Not just a residential or commercial thing: it's cross-cutting.
- Jenny: Regarding RE1: is this a place to include some discussion on City permitting, whether just pointing out good work so far, or opportunities.
 - Ross: There are things at the state level that could help, too.
 - Change the first line to "changes are necessary."

Transportation & Land Use

- Louis: Goals 2 and 3 make me think of the neighborhoods we had in 1955. You could walk to most of what you needed, rather than having to go farther away.
- Tony: Re: TCS1. Can we be more aggressive?
 - Brian: This was a big discussion in the working group. Lots of people thought doubling ridership was already very aggressive.
 - Tony: I'll check on the County goal.
 - Brendon clarified that this is a regional transit goal, but has local impacts (people drving in Minneapolis who do not live in Minneapolis).
- Peter Wagenius: Re: TCS2: Strike the word "potential."
- Gayle Prest: Should a Complete Streets policy be a priority?
 - Robin: It may be less important than for other cities. We have a lot of the bricks in place; we're not starting from scratch.
 - Brendon: In the working group, people pointed out that not having a formal complete streets policy may preclude some funding opportunities.
- Brian: Re: TDM4 and others. Words like "encourage" are perhaps too soft. Even "help" might be better words that relate to direct outcomes.
- Peter: Re: TCS3. Cities should have tools to participate directly in the financing of new transportation projects. For example, transit TIF, local option parking tax, etc. Don't specify the tool, but include "cities," not just "counties."

Waste & Recycling

- The version of O2 in the handout is the most recent.
- Sarah: Change O2 to include the next step: implementing citywide organics collection.
 - Loren: We're not there yet, so maybe not say that we should go citywide yet.
 - Robin: Some language in that strategy about going citywide eventually would be useful.

- Carl Michaud: We don't yet know the best way to collect organics in a cost effective manner and a manner that doesn't actually add GHG emissions (via collection). We want to remove organics from the waste stream.
- Julie: Things are changing rapidly in the organics area re: collection.
- Louis: It's early to say how we do it, but we need some sort of system for organics.
- Loren: "Increasing Organics Collection" (the strategy area) should not include the word "Collection."
- ° Carl: We're working with a lot of restaurants, etc. There's a lot happening and we can report back to the group. The residential side is trickier.
- Lea: Some of the existing composting rules exist because of the pesticides on food products.